1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. KRAMER: Good morning, your Honor. For the government, AUSAs Amanda Kramer and Stephanie Lake, and joining us at counsel table are FBI Special Agents John Robertson and Stacey Shahrani.

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: Arlo Devlin-Brown for the defendant and joining me at counsel table is my client, Anthony Weiner, and Erin Monju as well. Behind me is Paul Downs, also from my law firm, and Derek Stiles, paralegal in my office.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Devlin-Brown, have you and your client both read the presentence report?

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: We have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it with each other?

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: We have.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to the report other than what might be contained in your written sentencing submissions to me?

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: We do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: The presentence report will be made part of the record in this case and placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to this Court.

I have reviewed the PSR and the sexual offense risk evaluation of September 11, 2017, performed at the request of

2.3

the probation department. The defendant voluntarily participated in that examination and a 29-page report was issued.

And I've also received letters from the victim, the father, and grandmother, and the defendant's short response to those. All of those matters will be sealed as a part of the sentence.

In addition, I have a memorandum from the defendant with exhibits and a government memorandum. There have been limited redactions made to those documents. They have largely been filed in the public record. I have reviewed the proposed redactions. I approve each of them.

There was one request that I had with respect to Exhibit 43 to the defense sentencing submission which was originally filed entirely under seal. I asked the parties to consult, and I approve the proposed redactions that have been submitted to me and, therefore, Exhibit 43 is also not now largely in the public record.

I have received two letters from the public, one is from a concerned New Yorker. Another is from a Robert Donnelly. I just received Mr. Donnelly's letter this morning and will file those on ECF.

With respect to the sentencing guidelines issue here, which is our starting point, there are two relevant calculations. The crime here, which is the transfer of obscene

2.3

materials to a minor, is a violation of Section 1470. A minor is defined as someone under 16 years of age. One calculation for the sentencing guidelines is the 10-year maximum sentence under that statute. And that is because if you calculate the sentencing guidelines in a certain way, with many cross references considered that are contained in the sentencing guidelines, that leads to a sentencing guidelines range of 135 to 168 months. But because of the statutory maximum, the sentencing guidelines calculation becomes 10 years.

There is another sentencing guidelines calculation and it is a fairly straightforward one, straightforward application of the sentencing guidelines. It has a sentencing guidelines range of 21 to 27 months. And this is the sentencing guidelines that you would arrive at for a violation of 1470 without consideration of all those cross references.

The government in its plea agreement with the defendant acknowledged that that 21 to 27-month guidelines range is a fair and appropriate range in this case. The probation department itself has recommended a sentence within that range. I find independently, based on all the submissions that have been made to me, that it is the appropriate quidelines for the 1470 violation at issue here.

Therefore, I will be considering the parties' arguments with respect to this sentence in the context of the sentencing guidelines range of 21 to 27 months and, of course,

2.3

I'll be considering as well all the statutory factors in 3553(a) that a Court must always consider in connection with sentence. The probation department has recommended a sentence of 27 months. The government has recommended a sentence within the 21 to 27-month guidelines range, and the defendant has asked for a probationary sentence.

I want to note before I hear from the parties that the letters submitted to me have been very helpful. Some of them have been extraordinarily brave to write, and I found them informative and have considered them.

Let me start. I'll hear first from the government.

MS. KRAMER: Thank you, your Honor.

Anthony Weiner should be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 21 to 27 months and his request for probation rejected for two principal reasons: The seriousness of the offense and the need for deterrence.

On three separate occasions in early 2016, the defendant sat in his Manhattan apartment, got online and asked a real 15-year-old girl to display her naked body for him and sexually perform. There are no circumstances under which that is acceptable, excusable, or insignificant. Indeed, what the defendant did is a serious felony, as he knew full well from his decade as a United States congressman. The minor victim's motives and postoffense conduct don't undermine the seriousness of the actions knowingly taken by the defendant. Any effort to

shift the blame from the adult defendant to the minor victim in this case should be flatly rejected.

THE COURT: I don't actually find that the defendant is attempting to shift blame.

MS. KRAMER: Thank you, your Honor.

It's a longstanding principle of federal law that adults cannot engage in sexual conduct, online or otherwise, with minors of any age, including minor teenagers, and for good reason. Because minors don't have the same ability as adults to protect themselves and this is true no matter how grown up they may try to seem. The law on this point is clear and it must stay clear to affect general deterrence. Adults who knowingly ask any minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct online have committed a very serious offense and will be duly punished.

In this specific case a meaningful sentence of imprisonment is necessary not only to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to deter others, but also to specifically deter the defendant from reoffending.

The fact that Anthony Weiner is sitting here today is very sad for him and for those close to him. And while he undoubtedly does have regret, given where he is, and truly believes he will change, there is a history here that simply cannot be ignored. He has made these claims before, though not

in criminal cases, but he has made these claims and has failed to actually follow through or demonstrate a real acceptance or awareness of the nature of his errors in judgment. The offense conduct here shows an even more serious error in judgment, this time one that is criminal and one that affects a minor.

With that history, with the record in this case, there is not enough of a basis, in the government's view, for the Court to have comfort that he will in fact change of his own accord, even if supervised by probation. Something more and different is required, beyond personal and professional consequences, beyond the collateral consequences that he has faced before, beyond the scrutiny of the public, all of which have failed to sufficiently deter him in the past.

What is required here to stop the defendant from reoffending, to fully pierce his denial and end this tragic cycle is a meaningful term of imprisonment. The term that is warranted in this case is 21 to 27 months. That was adopted by the probation office, as your Honor recognized, who recommends a 27-month term of imprisonment.

Every single one of the mitigating factors raised by the defendant and considered by probation, including that the defendant is not a pedophile, doesn't collect or trade in child pornography, and never tried to meet the minor victim or other minors, are already fully and fairly reflected in the range of 21 to 27 months. No further reduction should be given by the

H9 Case IS17-cr-00307-DLC Document 49 Filed 10/03/17 Page 8 of 28

1 | Court.

2.3

In light of the seriousness of his crime, his demonstrative need for specific deterrence, and the need to reinforce the incredibly important principle that sexually engaging with any minors online is a serious crime, Anthony Weiner should be sentenced to prison for 21 to 27 months.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Devlin-Brown.

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: Thank you, your Honor. I want to start with a theme that Anthony sounded in his letter to the Court, which dealt with what for him was a paradox of regret. Because on the one hand, of course, he's filled with regret, not only for the crime and the harm he has caused to the victim here and to others in his life and himself, but for the whole pattern beyond this crime of for years throwing away a good portion of his life. So he's filled with regret there.

On the other hand, it was almost a year ago when Anthony's interactions with the victim here were published that caused him finally, after so many years of denial, to get treatment and for that he cannot be regretful. He is grateful.

I want to pick up on a point that Ms. Kramer just made because she noted that Anthony does have a long history and it is stunning, the history, really, that it took this, this criminal offense, for Anthony to realize there was a serious problem in his life.

2.3

He had thrown away his congressional career by exchanging messages with strangers on the Internet, an adult, and America and New York is a very forgiving place. He was on the verge, really — he was leading the New York City mayoral primary until the voters found out that even after he left Congress in this scandal he had continued with the same conduct.

In America they say there are second acts, but there are no third acts, and after that Anthony was finished. And yet even though his career had been ruined, he continued doing the same thing again and again.

One of the ironies I found here, your Honor, in looking through the history was that the gist of one of the original diagnoses back when he left Congress in 2011 was along the lines of Anthony was in control of his conduct and he was perhaps a powerful man, as powerful men sometimes do, acting out because they have that privilege and that power. And while that is something that could be plausible if you are looking at Anthony Weiner in 2011, it doesn't explain Anthony Weiner in 2016, after so much damage he had done to his life and he just kept on doing it.

Anthony Weiner had a sickness. Dr. Must, the probation officer's appointed evaluator, found that he was highly compulsive in his sexual behaviors and that they were motivated by addictive tendencies. And I know the label sex

addict, people have a visceral reaction sometimes against it because it just sounds like an excuse, notwithstanding the fact that there is increasing neurobiological research that it's ongoing, but it shows that anything that can sort of light up the reward center of the brain where those dopamine receptors are can lead to harmful behaviors that are difficult to stop.

Ultimately, your Honor, I don't think this is a case on these facts where the label really matters and a particular diagnosis really matters because I think it's clear that Anthony had a deep sickness, however you want to call it.

Just stepping back a little bit, he had ruined his career repeatedly by exchanging messages under his own name with strangers on the Internet, some portion of whom went public with their encounters, and then he did the exact same thing here. Ending up here today was almost -- perhaps not to Anthony Weiner, but perhaps to maybe anyone else who would have known he had done this -- foreseeable.

I submit these repeated acts of self-destruction are not those of a scheming criminal. That doesn't excuse him, but he was a sick man at the time he did this.

I think it's also important to emphasize that the sickness was not fundamentally or even really at all about a sexual obsession with teenagers. That's clear enough from his history. He had exchanged hundreds of messages or probably thousands of messages with hundreds of woman over the years,

2.3

all of whom had been adults. At the time of the offense, around the time of the offense, he was in contact with as many as 19 other adult women. This was his first teenager and it was his last teenage victim.

It's also clear from the court-appointed evaluator, Dr. Must, as it has been from everyone else who has examined him, that he does not have an abnormal sexual interest in teenagers.

The government's brief did attempt to cast some doubt on this a bit. It suggested that an isolated statement that Mr. Weiner had made to the examiner, as well as a supposed interest in particular sorts of pornography, suggested perhaps that there was something to a particular sexual interest in teenagers that is abnormal and deviant. I think those arguments, your Honor, could be readily rejected. I don't know if the Court has concerns about those.

THE COURT: I do not, and I didn't actually see that the government was making that argument in any developed way. I don't find there is any basis for it.

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: Thank you, your Honor.

Let me move on then beyond sort of the sickness, which I think is indisputable.

I think it's also indisputable that Anthony is in a very different place mentally and emotionally than he was a year ago. And the government says, well, this could be -- and

they give him credit for the work he has done, but they said this could be sort of a pattern that we have seen before.

Respectfully, your Honor, there is no pattern. There is no pattern. He sought treatment once in 2011, when he resigned from Congress, and he is the first to admit, he is very open with everyone, that he was not accepting of the treatment at the time. He didn't want to change his behavior at the time. And that, combined perhaps with therapy that says you are in charge of your behaviors, you can change them if you want, well, he didn't want. And that's a flaw of Anthony's, that he didn't want to change his behaviors at the time. But there hasn't been some long cycle after the 2013 mayoral campaign, it's not clear if he saw the therapist a few more times, but there was no big sort of public recovery and there was no private recovery either.

But more to the point, your Honor, the transformation that has occurred in Anthony is not something that remotely appears phony. Virtually every day over the past year he has been going to treatment of one form or another. He has been hobbling there on crutches after knee surgery and inspiring other people with his commitment to it.

There have been family members, family members who have been very hurt by the conduct Anthony Weiner has engaged in, who have observed now for the first time someone who is out of their deep denial and seems very committed to making

H9CASE 1.17-cr-00307-DLC Document 49 Filed 10/03/17 Page 13 of 28

themselves better.

2.3

Dr. Must, the independent evaluator, said specifically he is not, quote, putting on airs and that he appears to be taking his treatment very seriously. She added that if his motivation and dedication to his own progress continues at this pace and he is genuine and forthcoming in discussing his behaviors and continues to use the support and help offered to him, he has a strong potential of living a life that is sexually healthy, offense free, and value fulfilled. That's Dr. Musk, the independent evaluator.

Anthony doesn't need prison, your Honor, to continue on this path towards wellness. Dr. Must makes that clear. She says he can be treated within the community. She even urges the inclusion of his current therapist and the 12-step model that has been so helpful to him to be integrated into standard sex offender treatment that is often recommended in these cases.

So it can be done outside of prison and the cold reality, your Honor, is it won't happen in prison. The Bureau of Prisons, as we set out in our submission, does not offer any treatment probably of any form that Anthony Weiner would be eligible for, much less something that would be as suitable and as beneficial to what he has been found to have engaged in now.

The government makes the point, and it's a valid point, of course, that one of the goals of sentencing is to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prevent Anthony Weiner and deter Anthony Weiner from ever committing an offense like this again. And the defense of course agrees with that, your Honor. But I would submit that the best way to do that, the best way to do that is to allow him to continue on the progress he has been on for now, which is getting better and will help him avoid making the same mistakes he has before in a way that prison won't.

The government also makes the point, and it is also a valid point, how can we rely on this present claim of self-awareness and transformation. And the reason, your Honor, we recommend a probationary sentence is because it doesn't require reliance on that. A probationary sentence would impose substantial restrictions on his behavior, it would give the probation department substantial tools to see if he deviates from this path of treatment, and it would give the Court the power, which Mr. Weiner knows the Court had to use before, including in similar cases, to send him to jail should he slip off the path that he's been on. Probation can be for up to five years, where supervised release could be only three in this case. There are a lot of ways that probation can hold the prospect of prison over Anthony Weiner but allow him to continue a path that is much more successful in terms of getting treatment.

I understand, though, your Honor, that there is more, a lot more that goes into a sentencing determination than what

is good for the defendant and what will help the defendant get better, what will help their family. That's not the only thing that goes into a sentence.

And I know that one difficult thing in sentencing in this case is that, as Ms. Kramer pointed out, this is a serious offense. It is a very serious offense. And there is a question whether the weight of an offense like this requires prison, requires prison to reflect really the significance. I respectfully submit that that is not the case here.

Anthony's conduct was illegal and it was wrong, but it was significantly less egregious than really every other single instance of this crime involving the prosecution of adults for having sexual discussions with minors on the Internet than there has ever been.

All of the other cases that are out there that we have seen, certainly all in the Southern District, have involved defendants who are trolling the Internet looking for minor victims to exploit, and this case started in the other direction, with a minor victim reaching out to Anthony Weiner.

And Anthony Weiner didn't do any of the really disturbing predatory things that occur in almost every other case in one form or another. This wasn't an effort to have sexual contact with the victim, as it often is in these cases. He didn't disguise identity to win trust from the victim initially and obtain some explicit images only to, as many

H9ESE 1917-cr-00307-DLC Document 49 Filed 10/03/17 Page 16 of 28

defendants do, then threaten to expose the victim if the conduct ceases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

This case is very unusual. And I know your Honor has seen cases in a somewhat different context, in the child pornography context. And child pornography is an extraordinarily serious offense. It's extraordinarily serious. Even just viewing it, right, supports a market where this stuff is made. But there are nuances to that serious offense, too. There are defendants who one has to worry about whether they are going to molest children because they seem sexually obsessed with children and their pattern seems to be particularly focused on children. And then there are defendants in this brave new world of the Internet we live on who seem to be clicking on everything and click on things they shouldn't click on, but clearly don't have the same problematic behaviors that pose such a risk to society. This is a serious offense, your Honor. But there is a spectrum to these sorts of offenses.

That brings me to the very peculiar circumstances surrounding this offense, and the government intones that Anthony should be sentenced for what he did, not for what motivated the minor victim. And to a significant point they are absolutely right.

From the perspective of Anthony's morality, there are two completely independent decisions that occur. One is, the

victim made a decision to encourage Anthony to engage in his infamous behaviors in order to make a profit, which she did.

But that does not excuse Anthony's independent moral choice.

He had a moral choice. When confronted with someone he believed to be a minor to engage or not engage, he failed that moral test. So his moral failing is his own and his crime is his own.

But this point in the proceeding, your Honor, at sentencing is not the point where the question is, is Anthony guilty of making a bad moral choice, is he guilty of a crime. At this point the Court looks to a broader picture of the nature and circumstances of the offense.

And in many cases, your Honor, harm to the victim is a really crucial component of a sentence. There are times in all sorts of contexts where the damage that has occurred to an innocent person because the conduct of the defendant is so destructive that prison really is compelled.

And I submit that what Anthony did is wrong, what
Anthony did is harmful. But punishing him for what he did
here, which was to respond to someone where he had never
responded to a teenaged person before, someone who was looking
to capitalize on his compulsions, that is different in nature
than someone who is seeking out victims on the Internet to
exploit. They are both bad things, but there is a difference
and a significant difference.

Your Honor, I'd like to close with where we started in the sentencing submission. This is an unusual crime of sad coincidences that have had far-reaching consequences in this case. But as a morality play it's a complicated one. It's one I think without really true villains.

Your Honor, you have to obviously impose a sentence that is significant to the crime that's been committed in this case. But we would ask you to impose a sentence that is measured in terms of what actually occurred that recognizes that Anthony's sickness was a significant driver of it, that he's in recovery, that there is an opportunity to build on this recovery and have prison be a prospect if it's necessary, but not apply it now, and give an opportunity for something positive to emerge from the wreckage of all of this.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Weiner, I'll hear anything that you have to say to me on your behalf in connection with this sentence.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, with your permission, may I read it.

Your Honor, the crime I committed was my rock bottom, but I am truly grateful that it finally began me on my recovery. Every day since has been a little bit better than the one before.

I live a different and better life today. I'm no

longer in the hole. Now I focus on how to live my new smaller life one day at a time, and I'm working to make amends for my actions. I was a very sick man for a very long time, but I'm also responsible for the damage I have done. Your Honor, I have a disease, but I have no excuse.

Your Honor, I accept complete and total responsibility for my crime. I was the adult. I acted not only unlawfully but immorally. And if I had done the right thing, I would not be standing before you today. I am profoundly sorry to the victim for my crime.

The prosecutors are skeptical that I have truly changed, and I don't blame them. The description of me from the government's brief is right. I repeatedly acted in a obviously destructive way when I was caught. I claimed I would never do it again. I blamed others for my actions, but I didn't stop. I convinced myself that my behavior wasn't really the problem. It was something else. I know there is a name for people who act like that, an addict. I recognized it in my brother Seth, who was killed by his addiction, but I couldn't see it in myself.

But, your Honor, that's not me today. Today I am gratefully recovering. I am following a program of rigorous honesty, spiritual fitness, and an abundance of support. I go to therapy twice a week. I attend meetings every day. I look for ways to be of help to others who are sick and suffering and

who are struggling with what I have struggled with. And I look for ways and I hope and I pray that in the service that I do
I'm helping prevent other unknown victims, unknown innocents from themselves becoming victims.

Let me tell you a bit about my son. I left this to the end because I have trouble talking about him without tears. Jordan has been my salvation, the one perfect thing in my life. I always told myself, if I get that one thing right, all else would be forgiven. No matter what befell me, I would always be there for Jordan, showing him that if you get knocked down, you dust yourself off and you get back up.

Your Honor, I realize now that by not being honest about how I continued to knock myself down, I betrayed his amazing mother. I was teaching him the wrong things. I was hurting him instead of helping him.

Finally, your Honor, I'm teaching him the right lessons: Accepting responsibility, being truthful, and showing compassion and, yes, the ability of all of us, no matter how far we have fallen, to simply try to do the next right thing; and when we are wrong, promptly admit it. I am living in amends to him, your Honor, by being the father he needs.

I stand before you because I victimized a young person who deserved better. I fully accept responsibility for what I did. I have lost so much and appropriately so.

Your Honor, I'm not asking that you trust that my

recovery is real. I know it is real, which is all that matters. And I long ago forfeited the right to ask for the benefit of the doubt from you or from anyone, so I don't ask that you trust me. I ask you for the opportunity to prove that it is real. I ask for the opportunity on probation to keep leading my smaller, healthier life each day, to keep getting better, to be of service, and to be a good father to my son. If I fail, I know what will happen. But with God's grace, I will not.

Thank you, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: So the crime here was the defendant's engagement with a minor in early 2016. She contacted him. He was notorious. And as a result of their contacts he transferred obscene material to her. There were, as I understand it, four illegal exchanges: On Skype, Snapchat, and a site called Confide.

The defendant knew this young woman was in high school and getting her learner's permit. He never took any steps to ensure she wasn't a minor. She asserts, and he does not test or dispute, that at some point he learned she was 15.

When the minor continued or attempted to continue their exchanges, the defendant essentially stopped the conversation with her over the Internet somewhere in March of 2016, and this criminal behavior occurred at a time when the defendant was intensely engaged in online communications with

H9CMF19.7-cr-00307-DLC Document 49 Filed 10/03/17 Page 22 of 28

women, some sexual, some nonsexual conversations over the

Internet with strangers, and it had been a pattern of his for
at least five years.

The story that's been given to me indicates that it consumed an enormous amount of his time and his energy. And as he has acknowledged and his counsel has acknowledged, this pattern continued despite two very public exposures of online sexual exchanges with women. In one in 2011, he lost his congressional seat; another in 2013, he lost his chance to become mayor of New York.

The public exposure this time, in 2016, has been very different in a variety of ways, but I do find it to be true that it has led to the defendant's first serious engagement with treatment, and it appears to be effective for him. He has thrown himself into this treatment as intensely as he has thrown himself into so many other things he has done in his life. I think that's one of the hallmarks of his activity as it's been described to me in the submissions I have received. It's one of intensity and now he is intensely engaged in his treatment.

I have to look at the factors under Section 3553(a) to decide what is the appropriate sentence here for this crime and this defendant. Let me begin by talking about the issue of punishment. This was a serious crime and it's a serious crime that deserves serious punishment. He used pornography and

2.3

obscene language in requesting a minor to perform sexual acts for him over the Internet. I don't think that the complexity of the victim's motives or identity or the fact that she initiated this contact are relevant. They are irrelevant. She was a minor. She was a victim. She is entitled to the law's full protection.

Let me turn to the issue of individual deterrence. I think this is a much more complex question. There is no evidence whatsoever that the defendant has any deviant interest in teenagers or minors. There is no evidence he ever targeted teenagers or minors for any of his online activity. His illness did not involve sexual contact. It was an intense online engagement with his correspondents.

There is a uniform opinion by those who have examined him that he is an addict. He has a disease that involves sexual compulsivity. Some call it a sex addiction. It is sexually explicit conversations with strangers over the Internet. But I do find as well that he is finally receiving effective treatment for this disease for what is described as his hypersexuality. Steps are being taken and can continue to be taken to limit his access to social media, and that will be a very important part of his recovery.

He is participating in individual and group therapy. He is engaging in Sex Addicts Anonymous. I find he is making an enormous contribution to others who are suffering from that

same disease. I find that it is likely if he continues with this engagement that he can make an enormous contribution to society in both an awareness of this problem, the risks it involves to families, to those who suffer from the disease, and to those who may be victimized by the disease. I find this could be a true public service.

But the difficulty here is that this is a very strong compulsion, so strong, as we have seen, despite two very public disclosures and the destruction of his career on two occasions, he continued with the activity. So it is difficult to know how to weigh the issue of individual deterrence. He has made great strides, but it will remain a challenge for years to come.

Of course I have to be conscious of the fact that what I'm describing here is not criminal unless it crosses the line that our legislators have written. The crime here was engaging in this kind of activity with a minor over the Internet. That is not the focus of his addiction, but he did not control that behavior to make sure it didn't cross that line.

Let me turn to the last factor that's very important in deciding the sentence and that's one of general deterrence. There is a lot written about what role general deterrence should have in sentencing, but here I think it has enormous importance. Because of the defendant's notoriety, gained well before he engaged in this criminal activity, there is intense interest in this prosecution, in his plea, and his sentence,

and so there is the opportunity to make a statement that could protect other minors. General deterrence is a very significant factor in this sentence.

Mr. Weiner, please stand. I impose a term of imprisonment of 21 months to be followed by a term of supervised release of three years with the following special conditions: You must cooperate in the collection of DNA. You must comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act as directed by your probation officer and the Bureau of Prisons, as well as any state sex offender registration agency in the location in which you reside or work.

You must pay the fine that I will impose. You must comply with the standard conditions of supervised release. You must submit yourself to a reasonable search by the probation department. You must seek and maintain full-time employment. I want you engaged productively in full-time work. You are to provide the probation department access to any and all requested financial information.

With respect to some of the special conditions in the PSR, I'm looking in particular at pages 35 and 36. I impose the special condition at the bottom of page 35 requiring you to participate in a computer Internet monitoring program administered by the probation department.

Turning to page 36, you must submit to search of your

2.3

electronic storage devices and electronic communications. You may not have contact with the victim. You must not directly cause or encourage anyone else to have contact with the victim. You must participate in an outpatient sex offender treatment program approved by the probation department.

You shall be supervised by the district of your residence. You shall pay a special assessment of \$100. You shall pay a fine of \$10,000. You must begin paying that fine while in prison. Upon release from prison you shall pay 10 percent of your gross monthly income toward the fine.

I decline to impose any restitution. There is no mandatory restitution available under 3663(a) or 3664. Neither the government nor the probation recommends restitution. I have looked at 3663. It's largely irrelevant. To the extent it is not, I decline to impose restitution in the exercise of my discretion.

Counsel, is there any legal reason I cannot impose the sentence I described as stated?

MS. KRAMER: No, your Honor.

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I order the sentence I have described on the record to be imposed as stated.

I don't believe there are any open counts.

MS. KRAMER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Weiner, I need to advise you of your

H9CASE 1917-cr-00307-DLC Document 49 Filed 10/03/17 Page 27 of 28

right to appeal. If you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis.

Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. I'm required by law to advise you of those rights, though I know of no ground for an appeal. You entered a plea of guilty here pursuant to a plea agreement.

You have largely given up your right to appeal.

iou have largery given up your right to appear.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. KRAMER: Yes. Very briefly, your Honor. There was a consent preliminary order of forfeiture entered on May 19, at the time of the plea, as docket No. 6. I just wanted to call that to the Court's attention.

Counsel, is there anything else we need to do?

THE COURT: I believe that was the forfeiture of an iPhone.

MS. KRAMER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I make that forfeiture also part of the sentence.

MS. KRAMER: And, your Honor, the defendant has agreed in the plea agreement, and the law requires, that upon his release he must register under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, if the Court wants to advise the defendant of his reporting obligations under that act.

THE COURT: I think I did as part of the sentence.

MS. KRAMER: I apologize, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Devlin-Brown.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: Your Honor, I know the Court's ordinary practice for a defendant located in the New York City area is often to recommend incarceration in the New York City area. I've spoken to a prison consultant working with us, and have reason to believe this is true independently, that in a sentence of this length that recommendation could well result 7 in Mr. Weiner being incarcerated at the MDC, which is a maximum-security facility. I think given the importance contact with his son has played in his recovery and holding him 10 together, that would be extraordinarily detrimental. I would ask the Court to consider recommending FCI Schuylkill, and if 11 not that, recommend as low a security facility as necessary to 12 13 address your prison considerations.

THE COURT: Mr. Devlin-Brown, I don't make recommendations for particular facilities. Do you want me to recommend that the defendant be designated to a facility as close to the New York City area as possible, or not?

MR. DEVLIN-BROWN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to require the defendant to surrender by November 6 to the designated facility. If no facility has been designated by that time, he must surrender here to the marshals by 2 p.m. in this courthouse on November 6.

Thank you.

25 000